REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on February 15, 2011 and is being filed pursuant to a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) as provided under 37 CFR 1.114. At the time the Examiner mailed the Final Office Action claims 1 and 4-25 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended claims 1, 15 and 20; 2) added no new claims; and 3) canceled claims 14 and 22. As such, claims 1, 4-13, 15-21 and 23-25 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now represented.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejections

Claims 11, 13, 14 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wygodny, et al, U.S. Patent 6,202,199, (hereinafter "Wygodny").

With respect to claim 11, Wygodny does not describe:

> A method, comprising:
>> receiving debug information from a computer
> program at a filter and node builder;
>> building a node of debug information using
> configurable parameters from a configuration module,
> wherein the configurable parameters are selected
> from the group consisting of: priority, time stamp, host
> ID, metadata, separator, debug information, module
> name, sub-module name, priority, file name, line
> number, project name, and serial number;
>> transmitting the node through a network
> adaptor using a scheduler.

Claim 11 includes the limitation from claim 14. The Office Action cites Wygodny as describing this limitation. However, the citation to col. 8, lines 21-33 provides for none of these configurable parameters.

Accordingly, Wygodny does not describe claim 11. Claims 12-13 are dependent on claim 11 and are allowable for at least this rationale.

Appl. No.: 10/550,851   8   Atty. Docket No.: 42P21031
Amdt. dated 07/15/2011
Reply to the Final Office action **of** 02/15/2011

With respect to claim 20, Wygodny does not describe:

> A computer system, comprising:
> a processor;
> a network adaptor operatively coupled to the processor;
> at least one flash device operatively couple to the processor on which firmware instructions are stored; and
> at least one storage device on which computer program code is stored, which when executed by the processor performs operations comprising:
> receiving debug information from a computer program upon the occurrence of an error during execution of the program code;
> <u>applying configuration parameters to the debug information to create a debug information node, wherein the debug information node includes data selected from the group of: priority, time stamp, host ID, metadata, separator, debug information, module name, sub-module name, priority, file name, line number, project name, and serial number</u>; and
> transmitting the debug information node via the network adaptor to a remote computer.

Again, the citation from Wygodny does not describe any of "wherein the configurable parameters are selected from the group consisting of: priority, time stamp, host ID, metadata, separator, debug information, module name, sub-module name, priority, file name, line number, project name, and serial number."

Accordingly, Wygodny does not describe claim 20. Claims 21 and 23-25 are dependent on claim 20 and are allowable for at least the same rationale.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 4-6 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wygodny, in view of Chkodrov, et al., U.S. Publication 2005/0086644 (hereinafter "Chkodrov").

With respect to claim 1, the combination does not describe:

> A method, comprising:
> executing a program code on a first computer system;
> halting execution of the program code upon an occurrence of an error during execution;
> generating debug information upon the occurrence of the error during execution of the program code, wherein generating debug information is performed by executing a function call in the program code to a network print driver;
> transmitting the debug information to the network print driver;
> resuming execution of the program code after transmitting the debug information to the network print driver; and
> transmitting the debug information to a second computer system via a network adaptor.

The combination does not describe "generating debug information upon the occurrence of the error during execution of the program code, wherein generating debug information is performed by executing a function call in the program code to a network print driver." The Office Action has asserted that Wygodny's col. 6, lines 1-9 describe this. These lines discuss what an attached agent at the client does. Specifically, that the agent "extracts trace information, such as execution paths, subroutine calls, and variable usage, from the client." (Wygodny, col. 6, lines 1-3.) A TCI file from the developer provides the details about what information should be collected. This trace data is written to a trace buffer and one command from the user, the agent copies the contents of the trace buffer to a trace log. There is

nothing in this that fairly suggests generating debug information by executing a function call in the program code to a network print driver.

The Office Action goes on to say:

> Note that Wygodny discloses a method for developer to access to trace information of a client computer remotely, thus internet is needed for the trace information to be transmitted back to the developer, the network print driver is just a network protocol to transfer file from one computer to another...

Wygodny does describe a user sending the trace log file back to the developer. However, what that has to do with "generating debug information by executing a function call in the program code to a network print driver" is unclear. All trace information is just extracted as the program executed, sent to a log, and then transmitted. That is not what is being claimed.

The combination does not describe "transmitting the debug information to the network print driver." First the debug information is not generated as claimed. Moreover, there is no network print driver discussed in either reference generic assertion aside.

Finally, the combination does not describe "transmitting the debug information to a second computer system via a network adaptor." Again, the debug information is created differently and therefore not described by the combination.

Accordingly, the combination does not describe claim 1 as a whole. Claims 4-14 are dependent on claim 1 and allowable for at least the same rationale.

Claim 15 has similar limitations as claim 1 and is allowable for similar rationale. Accordingly, the combination does not describe what claim 15 requires. Claims 16-19 are dependent on claim 15 and are allowable for at least the same rationale.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact David F. Nicholson at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/15/11

/David F. Nicholson/
David F. Nicholson
Reg. No.: 62,888

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300